The Effects of the Muslim Conquest on the Persian Population of Iraq

Author(s): Michael G. Morony

Source: *Iran*, 1976, Vol. 14 (1976), pp. 41-59

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4300543

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Iran*

THE EFFECTS OF THE MUSLIM CONQUEST ON THE PERSIAN POPULATION OF IRAQ[1]

By Michael G. Morony

Persians have always been a minority in Iraq, but for most of classical and late antiquity they were a ruling minority. Apart from the concentration of Persians along the foothills of the Zagros mountains and the upper reaches of the tributaries of the Tigris, which was merely an extension of the Persian settlement on the Iranian plateau, the large-scale Persian immigration into the Mesopotamian plain began with the rise of the Sasanian state in the third century A.D. Drawn to the court at Ctesiphon, posted as administrators and garrisons to positions in the western quarter of the empire, or brought in as agricultural labour, the Persian presence in Iraq was largely the result of the military, administrative, and economic requirements of the Sasanians.

Unfortunately, there are no reliable figures for the size and distribution of the Persian population in Sasanian Iraq, but it is possible to approach questions of demographic change by comparing settlement patterns and by noting the shifts in population that included Persians. The Sasanian policy of establishing an ethnic Persian presence in the west implemented by transfers of population led to a demographic pattern of settlement along the outer edge of southern and western Iraq as permanent frontier garrisons, in the major cities of Iraq by the families of aristocratic Persians, and in villages in the Sawād. This movement began in the third century with the settlement of a permanent garrison at Anbār[2] followed by the settlement of 12,000 upper-class Persian families (*ahl bait*) from Iṣṭakhr and Iṣfahān at Naṣībīn when that city was taken from the Romans in 363 A.D.[3] In the early sixth century Qubādh I (488–96, 499–531) is said to have settled people brought from other places in villages in upper and lower Iraq.[4] By the end of the Sasanian period there was a belt of defensive Persian settlements in the outposts of 'Ain at-Tamr,[5] Qādisiyya,[6] the oases called 'Uyūn aṭ-Ṭaff,[7] and in the garrison cities of Ḥīra,[8] Anbār,[9] and Sinjār.[10] There were also significant numbers of Persians in cities such as Naṣībīn,

[1] The basis of this article is a paper presented at the eighth annual meeting of the Middle East Studies Association, Boston, Massachusetts, on November 7th 1974.

[2] Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-Buldān* (Leipzig, 1866), III, p. 929.

[3] Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden* (Leiden, 1879), p. 63: Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh ar-Rusul wa-l-Mulūk*, (Leiden, 1879), I, p. 843: H. Zotenberg, *Chronique de Abou-Djafar-Mo'hammed-ben-Djarîr-ben-Yezid Tabari, traduite sur la version persane d'Abou-' Ali Mo'hammed Bel'ami* (Paris, 1938), II, p. 99. According to the *Nihāyatu l-arab* there were 12,000 Persians from Iṣṭakhr and 4,000 from Iṣfahān settled in Naṣībīn (E. G. Browne, " Some Account of the Arabic Work entitled ' Niháyatu ' l-irab fi akhbári ' l-Furs wa'l-'Arab,' particularly of that part which treats of the Persian Empire," *JRAS*, XXXII (1900), p. 221). In the sixth century, Naṣībīn was still a Persian city (G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus Syrischen Akten Persischer Märtyrer. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* VII, (Leipzig, 1880), p. 83) with Persian notables (P. Devos, " Sainte Sirin, martyre sous Khosrau I[er] Anosarvan," *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXIV (1946), p. 107). Mar Babai of Naṣībīn, a disciple of Abraham of Kashkar in the early seventh century, was a descendent of the Persians settled at Naṣībīn by Shāpūr II (J. B. Chabot, " Le livre de la chasteté composé par Jésus-denah, Évêque de Baçra," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XVI (1896), p. 235).

[4] A. Scher, " Histoire Nestorienne (Chronique de Séert) ", part II (2), *Patrologia Orientalis*, XIII (1919), pp. 124–5.

[5] Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-Buldān* (Leiden, 1866), p. 246; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2062.

[6] Qādisiyya was garrisoned by a force sent by Khusrau II Parvīz to protect the desert frontier after the fall of the Lakhmids, (Qazwini, *Kosmographie*, (Gottingen, 1848–9), II, p. 159).

[7] Ibn Rusta, *Les Atours prècieux* (Cairo, 1955) p. 120; Yaqūt, II, p. 476; III, pp. 539–40.

[8] Before the fall of the Lakhmids, the Sasanians stationed a body of 1,000 cavalrymen (*asāwira*) at Ḥira as reinforcements. After a year's service they were recalled and replaced by another troop (M. J. Kister, " Al-Ḥīra, Some Notes on its Relations with Arabia ", *Arabica*, XV (1968), p. 167). After the fall of the Lakhmids, a regular garrison under a *marzbān* was established at Ḥīra. Persian *dahāqīn* also lived at Ḥīra (J. Horovitz, " Adi Ibn Zeyd—The Poet of Hira ", *Islamic Culture*, IV (1930), p. 35) and Persian was spoken and written there (Ṭabari, I, pp. 2052–3).

[9] Zotenberg, III, p. 336. The descendents of the Persians settled at Anbār by Shāpūr I are supposed to have been still living there at the time of the Muslim conquest in the seventh century (Balādhurī, p. 177).

[10] According to the Arabic tradition reported on the authority of the Shaikhs of Sinjār, Khusrau II Parvīz had wanted to dispose of 100 rebellious Persians and sent them against Sinjār at a time when it was held by the Byzantines. Two of them died on the way, but the other 98 joined the Persian

[*continued on next page*

Takrīt, Ctesiphon,[11] Veh-Ardashīr,[12] and Kaskar, to say nothing of towns such as Irbil and Kirkūk located in heavily Persian districts.

The structure of Persian society in the Sasanian period may be described in two alternative ways. One of them presents the picture of an internally subdivided four-class system organized for the separate performance of military, religious, administrative, or economic responsibilities. The priesthood had its own elaborate hierarchy. Soldiers were divided into cavalry and infantry and were distinguished by rank. The bureaucratic class included correspondence secretaries, accountants, court clerks, and official historians, as well as physicians, poets, and astrologers (the latter three because of their connection with the royal court). The fourth estate was made up of farmers, herdsmen, artisans, and merchants, the vast majority of the productive, tax-paying public. All classes were bound by separate codes decreed and registered by the state, which were intended to preserve the integrity and usefulness of each by preventing anyone from changing his occupation and by providing external, visual distinctions among them through the special, identificatory clothing which the members of each class wore. Movement from one class to another was supposed to be exceptional and was subject to the approval of the monarch himself. Instructors and teachers were appointed to train the members of each class or sub-class in their profession.[13]

However, this structure, which depends largely on Sasanian royal, religious, and legal traditions, is presented in an abstract, generalized and idealized form, and it is difficult to find such a society in actual operation. While the professions certainly existed and tended to be hereditary, this schematic division into caste-like classes arbitrarily assigned by the state hardly seems to be a valid reflection of the long-term realities of Sasanian society. Rather, it is part of the Sasanian theory of the state. The rationale behind it is provided in the salutation of a letter ascribed to Ardashīr I and addressed to his subjects as follows: " To the secretaries who are in charge of the administration of affairs, to the priests who are the preservers of religion, to the cavalrymen who are the defenders of the state, to the labourers who make the state prosperous . . ."[14] The success of the state depended on the performance by each class of its responsibilities, as expressed in the classic Sasanian formulation of the " circle of power ", again ascribed to Ardashīr, that there is no ruler without men, no men without money, no money without prosperity, and no prosperity without justice and good administration.[15] Consequently, this picture of Sasanian society should be regarded more as a statement of policy, associated with the restoration of order after the Mazdakite risings in the late Sasanian period when there may have been a real attempt under Khusrau I Anūshirvān to freeze society in this fashion for the benefit of the state.

In practice, the official classes overlapped a good deal. Peasants also served in the army as infantry. Bureaucrats (*kuttāb*) wore the clothing of their class in town, but when they accompanied the king on campaign they wore the clothing of soldiers.[16] There does not seem to have been any hindrance to marriage among the members of the first three estates, with a resulting confusion over the profession of the children. The aristocratic sixth-century administrator, Babai, who was *istandār* of Naṣībīn and the father of the Christian convert and martyr Mihrāmgushnasp/Giwargīs (d. 615), married the daughter of a *mōbadh*. Their son, Mihrāmgushnasp, is described only as an aristocratic absentee landlord.[17] Similarly, we find the son of a *hirbadh* engaged in the defence of the Sawād against the

continued from previous page]
force before the city, helped them take it and settled there and then began to multiply (Balādhurī, p. 177). Although Dara would suit the circumstances of this story better than Sinjār, Sinjār was occupied by Persian troops at the time of the conquest because we are told that they were evacuated after the battle of Qādisiyya (Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj* (*Livre de l'impot foncier*) (Paris, 1921), p. 64).

[11] Sa'd is said to have taken 12,000 Persian horsemen captive at Ctesiphon and the same text says that there were many Persians living in Madā'in (Tabarī, I, p. 2451).

[12] A man from Iṣṭakhr, Shahrbarāz, was killed in the seige of Veh-Ardashīr/Bahurasīr, and in the story of the siege we are told that all the people in Bahurasīr were Persians (Tabarī, I, pp. 2426, 2528).

[13] M. Boyce, *The Letter of Tansar* (Rome, 1968), pp. 38–41; S. J. Bulsara, *The Laws of the Ancient Persians as found in the " Mâtîkân E Hazâr Dâtastân "* or *" The Digest of a Thousand Points of Law "*, (Bombay, 1937), p. 49; Jāḥiz, *Kitāb at-Tāj fī Akhlāq al-Mulūk* (Cairo, 1914), p. 25; Jahshiyarī, *Kitāb al-Wuzarā'wa-Kuttāb* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 3; J. Latz, *Das Buch der Wezire und Staatssekretäre von Ibn 'Abdus al-Ǧahšiyārī* (Bonn, 1958), p. 54; C. Pellat, *Le livre de la couronne* (Paris, 1954), p. 53.

[14] Mas'ūdi, *Les prairies d'or* (Paris, 1965), I, p. 220.

[15] Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar Akhbār Mulūk al-Furs wa-Siyaruhum*, (*Histoire des rois des Perses*). (Paris, 1900), p. 482.

[16] Jahshiyārī, p. 3; Latz, p. 54.

[17] A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (Copenhagen, 1944), pp. 489–90: Hoffman, p. 95; O. Braun, *Ausgewählte Akten persischer Märtyrer* (Munich, 1915), p. 223.

Muslims as a local landed aristocrat who had married into a branch of the royal family.[18] Nor were administrative careers closed to those outside or below the scribal class. The story of the shoemaker who unsuccessfully tried to get a position as scribe for his son in the reign of Khusrau I Anūshirvān (531–79)[19] should be balanced by the case of Farrukhzādh b. Sumayy, tax collector for Khusrau II Parvīz (590–628) in the 620s, who was a lower-class person (*'ilj*) from the village of Khandaq in the subdistrict (*ṭassūj*) of Bahūrasīr (Veh-Ardashīr).[20] His elevation was resented, to be sure (as was his extortionate and efficient collection of taxes), and it may be that in these examples which come from the late sixth and early seventh century we are dealing with a breakdown of the mid-sixth century establishment which was under way after only about a generation.

The " decadence of rank " and mixing of classes which the *Letter of Tansar* presents as representing the conditions immediately preceding and as being the reason for the establishment of the four-class system, could apply equally well to the degeneration of that system (if it ever really existed) by the later sixth century. The *Letter* describes how unscrupulous social climbers without nobility, ancestral lands, or skill in a trade, with no respect for noble descent or for the professions, acquire fortunes by denouncing others, while the descendents of noble families abandon their dignity and manners to support themselves as tradesmen, marry beneath them, and produce children of mean character.[21] This would be an extremely fluid society, and its description serves more to delineate the antithesis of the Sasanian ideal than to provide an abstract generalization of widespread or long-term social conditions.

These general problems for the description of Persian society in the late Sasanian period are complicated still further when one turns to Iraq. Here there is little evidence for the presence of merchants or artisans among the Persian population. One has to deal with the employment of non-Persians and non-Magians at almost all levels of the administration and with a growing class of Christian Persian landed aristocrats and courtiers. How were such people integrated into an official class system that had meaning in a Magian, and possibly Zurvanite, context? At the same time, the religiously-sanctioned social customs of Magians and the hierarchy of Magian priests was part of the Persian cultural presence in Iraq. As a general rule, outside the area of heavy Persian settlement east of the Tigris, Magians were to be found among the members of the military garrisons, administration, and landed aristocracy. The notables of Naṣībīn were still Magians in the early sixth century,[22] and there were Magians at Ḥīra and in the surrounding countryside.[23] From Furāt to Anbār the Persian upper class in the towns of the Sawād and the *dahāqīn* in the countryside were Magian. There were Magians wherever Persian troops were stationed in Iraq, especially in the fortresses along the south-western frontier. East of the Tigris there were Magians in the towns and villages of Adiabene and Bēth Garmē,[24] and there was an important community of Magians at Hālē in Rādhān.[25] However, the caste aspects of Magianism and conversions to Christianity make it unwise to identify the areas of Persian settlement as corresponding exactly to the presence of Magians, or even to equate Magians with Persians engaged in the service of the state in Iraq.

The priestly hierarchy itself might be used to locate Magians, both in their own persons and because Magian priests fulfilled both ritual and judicial responsibilities towards other Magians. The *mōbadhān mōbadh* sat at Ctesiphon of course, or wherever the monarch happened to be, and there were *mōbadhs* for the provinces of Bēth Aramāyē, Maisān, and Adiabene in Iraq.[26] Within each province there were supposed to be subordinate ecclesiastical districts under subordinate *mōbadhs*, but it is impossible to tell whether or not they corresponded to the sub-districts of the secular administration or how far the system extended in Iraq. The only real evidence for the existence of the lower levels of the system in Iraq comes from the areas of heavy Persian settlement along the Tigris and its tributaries. In the reign

[18] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2245, For his identification with Anōshagān son of Gushnaspmah, see page 44 below.

[19] Boyce, p. 39.

[20] Nöldeke, p. 352; Tabarī, I, p. 1041. The Arabic sources for Iraq in this period fairly consistently reserve terms such as *'ajam* and *'ilj* for Persians.

[21] Boyce, pp. 39, 44.

[22] Scher, II(1), *Patrologia Orientalis*, VII (1950), p. 157. The Persian notables settled at Naṣībīn by Shapur II in the fourth century had been Magians (J. B. Abbeloos, " Acta Mar Ḳardaghi ", *Analecta Bollandiana*, IX (1890), p. 77).

[23] Chabot, pp. 43, 261; Scher, II (2), p. 549.

[24] Chabot, pp. 4, 16–17, 230, 239–40.

[25] Scher, II (1), p. 157.

[26] Chabot, p. 278; Christensen, p. 118; Hoffmann, pp. 81–8; P. Peeters, " Le passionaire d'Adiabene ", *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLIII (1925), pp. 269, 279, 282.

of Shāpūr II in the fourth century, there are references to two *mōbadhs* of districts (*mōḥpaṭē dh^{e}-ethrawathē*) in Adiabene who were judges (*dayyan*),[27] and to a Magian of the district (*magōshā dh^{e}-ethrā*) who was a subordinate of the archimagos of Adiabene.[28] There was a *mōḥpaṭ* at Ḥālē in Rādhān in the fifth century who is described holding court on the judgment seat (*bēma*) before the assembled people of the town.[29]

At the same time, there is little evidence for the existence of fire temples in Iraq. There were fire temples at Ctesiphon and Irbil and in the heart of the Sawād near Sūrā and a royal foundation by Būrān at Astīniyā near Baghdādh.[30] But the nature of the Magian cult itself, which did not require public participation for it to be effective, made professional Magians something of a sacerdotal caste, and lower-class Persians, at least in Iraq, amounted to little more than pagans. General public participation only occurred during annual festivals when the scriptures were recited by the priests while the common people took part in dances. Otherwise, the performance of the cult and typically Magian social customs were a matter of private or family observances. There is a very significant description of a noble Magian family at Kirkūk in the later sixth century gathered around the fire altar in their home for the morning prayer.[31] Magianism was essentially an upper-class tradition in Sasanian Iraq where nobles and priests exposed their dead, practiced the prayer of silence at mealtime, contracted endogamous marriages, and saw to the religious education of their children.

In the face all of these difficulties, it seems far more reasonable to speak of a class of landed Persian aristocrats, themselves organized in a hierarchic system of ranks and grades, which monopolized the military, administrative, and religious positions in the state. This is, in fact, the second alternative provided in the *Letter of Tansar* where the important distinction is between nobles and commoners. Nobles are distinguished visibly from commoners, especially artisans and tradesmen, by their clothing and symbols of rank, their trousers, headgear and horses, the silk clothing of their women, their servants, houses and gardens, and by the noble occupation of hunting. It is intermarriage between nobles and commoners that is forbidden. A noble who marries a commoner is disinherited and commoners are forbidden to buy the household possessions or estates of nobles.[32] This difference was intensified by the fact that the members of the royal family, the high nobility, soldiers, *hirbadhs*, secretaries, and those in royal service were all exempt from the poll tax.[33] The heads of the Magian priesthood, of the administrative and military hierarchies, of the landed aristocracy, and of state-run enterprises, were all members of the high nobility mainly by virtue of their positions at court.[34] This situation is also reflected in the account which describes Anūshirvān sending a messenger to all those in Iraq and Iran who were the leaders of their class: to landowners, generals, soldiers, and the principal scribes.[35]

Apart from being available in such general, theoretical statements, this alternative has the added advantage that it is actually possible to find and describe a single vertical social hierarchy among Persians in late Sasanian Iraq with the peasants at the bottom. At the top of this hierarchy was the Sasanian royal family itself, supported by their domain land scattered throughout the Sawād.[36] The most important branch of the royal family with lands in lower Iraq was the house of Narsī, the son of a maternal aunt of Khusrau II Parvīz. Narsī had been granted the entire crown province of Kaskar about 624 as a fief (*qaṭī'a*). The special property assigned for his support was at an-Nirsiyān, provided with storehouses and protected by a stronghold, which is called his *ḥimā* and is probably the same as the Dār Narsī in the district of Kaskar. At the time of the Muslim conquest the stronghold was in the possession of Narsī's daughter, Tamāhīj, and her husband Anōshagān son of Gushnaspmah. He was the nephew of Narsī and if he is to be identified with Anōshagān son of the *hirbadh*, it would mean that a *hirbadh* named Gushnaspmah had married a sister of Narsī or that Narsī's own brother was a *hirbadh*.

[27] Abbeloos, p. 75.
[28] Peeters, p. 281.
[29] Hoffman, p. 72.
[30] Abbeloos, p. 16; Mas'ūdī, II, p. 544; J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*, V (Leiden, 1970), p. 24; Scher, II (1), p. 165.
[31] Devos, p. 96.
[32] Boyce, pp. 44, 48.
[33] Christensen, p. 367; D. Dennett, *Conversion and the Poll Tax in Early Islam* (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 15, 28; F. Løkkegaard, *Islamic Taxation in the Classic Period* (Copenhagen, 1950), pp. 132, 142: Nöldeke, p. 246; Ṭabarī, I, p. 962; Zotenberg, II, pp. 223–4, 341.
[34] Bulsara, p. 50.
[35] Zotenberg, II, p. 224.
[36] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2371, 2540.

Bistām b. Narsī, the *dihqān* of Burs at the time of the conquest, is likely to have been the son of this member of the royal family.[37]

Directly below the royal family and sharing many of its privileges was a small number of families of very high nobility (*vāspuhr, ahl al-buyūtāt*) believed to have been descended from the vassal kings of the Parthian period. They are said to have been allowed to retain the rank of " kings " and the right to wear a crown because their ancestors had been the equals of the Sasanians.[38] Traditionally, only seven families had these privileges, the most visible of which was the right to wear a tall, conical *qalansuwa* worth 100,000 dirhams.[39] However, Mas'ūdī speaks of only three great families established by the Sasanians in the Sawād,[40] and, in fact, only representatives of the Sūrēn, Qārēn, Mihrān, and Hurmuzān can be found even peripherally associated with Iraq.[41] But there were other people of the same level of nobility in Iraq at the time of the conquest, among whom were the Sasanian generals Jālinūs (Galienus?)[42] and Jābān,[43] both of whom are called " kings ". Rustam, the Sasanian general at Qādisiyya, also seems to have belonged to this aristocratic élite because he possessed a *qalansuwa* worth 100,000 dirhams.[44] The participation of these representatives of the high nobility in the defence of Iraq seems to have been at least in part motivated by the fact that a number of " kings " had estates (*ḍiyā'*) at aṭ-Ṭaff.[45]

Next in rank was the class of *shahrījān* (Ar. *shahārija*),[46] so named because the official (*radh, shahrīj*) in charge of a province (*shahr, kūra*) was chosen from among them.[47] *Ispāhbadhs* and *marzbāns*, likewise, by virtue of being governors of provinces, seem to have belonged to this level of the aristocracy because Mas'ūdī puts them in the second rank of courtiers right after the high nobility.[48] The best representative of this class in lower Iraq at the end of the Sasanian period is Āzādhbih b. Bāniyān b. Mihrbundādh al-Hamadhānī who was *marzbān* of Ḥīra from 613 to 630 or 634.[49] From what little is known about him, he gives the impression of a person on his way up in the Persian hierarchy. He is said to have achieved a position of " half nobility " and the right to wear a *qalansuwa* worth 50,000 dirhams, along with a close personal interest in the fate of the agricultural districts east of the Euphrates around Amghīshiyā.[50] He had also been able to secure the marriage of his daughter to one of his neighbours (and social superiors), the lord (*ṣāḥib*) of Sinnīn who was a member of the high nobility (one of the *mulūk*).[51]

At the bottom of this aristocratic hierarchy were the small landed proprietors (*tunnā'*, *marē qōryē*). Administrators for the rural subdistricts in Sasanian Iraq were drawn from this class, and since each subdistrict was grouped around a village (*dēh*), the official in charge was called a *dēhīj* or *dēhīk*, and the entire class was called *dēhkānān* (Ar. *dahāqīn*). They are said to have been further divided into five grades each distinguished by its clothing.[52] While there is no indication of what these distinctions might have involved, the *dahāqīn* as a class had the prerogative of riding the kind of horse called a

[37] Balādhurī, p. 340; F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg, 1895), p. 17; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2168, 2245; Zotenberg, III, p. 371. Justi regards the name of an-Nūshājān b. Jusnasmā in Ṭabarī as the Arabicized form of Anōshagān-i Gushnaspmah. Anōshagān means "descendent of the house of Anōsh", and his father's name, which means "stallion of Media", would suggest that the family had only been in the Sawād for a generation. For Bistām b. Narsī, see Balādhurī, pp. 259, 457–8; Tabarī, I, p. 2421; and Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, (Leiden, 1883), II; p. 176. Bistām was also the name of a brother of Hurmizd IV who was the uncle of both Khusrau II Parvīz and Narsī.

[38] Løkkegaard, p. 171; Zotenberg, III, p. 448.

[39] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2025.

[40] Mas'ūdī, I, p. 247.

[41] Elias of Naṣībīn, *Opus Chronologicum* I, *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* LXII, *Scriptores Syri*, XXI, 56–7; CSCO LXIII, *Scriptores Syri*, XXIII, p. 31; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2025, 2027, 2534; Thomas of Marghā, *The Book of the Governors* (London, 1893), II, pp. 150–1; Zotenberg, III, pp. 324–6; Hoffmann, p. 210. Bahrām Chūbīn belonged to the house of Mihrān (F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Ein Asiatischer Staat, Feudalismus unter den Sasaniden und ihren Nachbarn* (Weisbaden, 1954), p. 144; P. Peeters, " Les ex-voto de Khosrau Aparwez à Sergiopolis ", *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXV, p. 47) as did the Christian convert and martyr Mihramgushnasp (Hoffman, p. 95).

[42] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2341; Zotenberg, III, p. 397.

[43] Balādhurī, p. 242; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2032; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 147.

[44] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2340.

[45] Ibid., p. 2247.

[46] Christensen, p. 140; Mas'ūdī, I, p. 247.

[47] Nöldeke, pp. 446–8; Ya'qūbī, I, p. 203.

[48] Mas'ūdī, I, pp. 217–18.

[49] Nöldeke, p. 348; G. Rothstein, *Die Dynastie der Laḫmiden in al-Ḥīra* (Berlin, 1899), p. 124; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 1038–9, 2037.

[50] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2037.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 2233; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 163.

[52] Christensen, p. 140; Løkkegaard, p. 168; Mas'ūdī, I, pp. 247–8.

birdhawn (destrier) and of wearing golden rings.[53] They were also included among those who could wear the *qalansuwa*.[54] Although it is impossible to identify five separate grades of *dahāqīn*, there was an important practical distinction between those who lived in towns and administered their estates as absentee landlords and those who lived on their estates in the countryside.

One of the best examples of the pattern of town residence by nobles with rural property at the end of the Sasanian period is the family of Mihrāmgushnasp/Gīwargīs. His father had been *istandār* of Naṣībīn, his grandfather had been prefect of New Antioch for Khusrau Anūshirvān, and while the family possessed the village of Paqōryā in Nanēshtār (Nistar) in the Sawād, Mihrāmgushnasp owned a house in the capital and had put a Christian overseer in charge of his villages and other property.[55] Although he was a member of the high nobility the same pattern was followed by the *dahāqīn* who lived at Anbār,[56] Kaskar,[57] Kirkūk,[58] and Ḥīra. At the time of the conquest, the *dahāqīn* of Ḥīra possessed estates (*ḍiyā'*) on the other side of the Euphrates in the territory of Amghīshayā.[59]

Outside of the towns there was a lower grade of *dahāqīn* scattered throughout the villages and rural subdistricts for which they were responsible. There are references in the context of the conquest to the " *dahāqīn* of the villages " in the countryside around Amghīshayā;[60] to *dahāqīn* in Dast-i Maisān;[61] in the territory between Ḥīra and Kaskar;[62] and to the Persians of Maisān and the Kuwar Dijla who were led in the defence of their lands by a notable of Abadhqubādh named Failakān.[63] The Persian general called Andarzaghar seems representative of this class. He was one of the local landowners (*tunnā'*) who had been born in the Sawād, and particular mention is made of the fact that he had been neither born in the capital (Madā'in) nor raised there.[64] At this level where the *dahāqīn* appear to merge with the headmen of villages, the class was not exclusively Persian, and it is possible to find Aramaean and Arab *dahāqīn* at the time of the conquest.[65]

There is also evidence for the settlement of Persian peasants in late Sasanian Iraq. They seem to have been fairly common along the lower Tigris in Kaskar and Maisān,[66] and there is a reference to an entire village located near Kaskar in the early seventh century, the inhabitants of which were the descendents of people brought forcibly from Khurasan (probably as part of those people relocated by Qubādh I in the aftermath of the Mazdakite risings).[67] There also seem to have been Persian peasants around the capital. Farrukhzādh b. Sumayy has already been noticed, and at the siege of Bahurasīr (Veh-Ardashīr) by Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ in 16/637 a large number of Persian peasants (*'ulūj li-ahli Fārs*) were rounded up in the villages and reed thickets outside the city and were only released when Shīrzādh the *dihqān* of Sābāṭ vouched for them.[68] A little later, in the context of the fall of Madā'in, there is a reference to some commoners (*a'lāj*) outside the city who " belonged " to a Persian cavalryman stationed there.[69]

Thus, by the end of the Sasanian period Persians were to be found concentrated along the line of the Zagros as an extension of the national settlement on the plateau, in a defensive perimeter along the southwest border as garrison troops, in all of the major cities and towns as administrators and absentee landlords, and on estates scattered through the countryside from Anbār to Furāt and from Ḥulwān to Ḥīra as minor landed notables. They were organized in a graded, hierarchical class system: the royal

[53] Balādhurī, p. 271. The *dahāqīn* were also in charge of the list of young men liable for military service from which they procured recruits for the infantry (Løkkegaard, p. 169). Altheim (pp. 134–5, 140–1) regards the establishment of the *dahāqīn* as part of the restoration under Khusrau I Anūshirvān. As landed aristocracy, they provided cavalry for the army.

[54] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2067. Even the Nestorian catholicos, Sabhrīshō' (596–604) wore a *qalansuwa* (Scher, II (2), pp. 492, 494).

[55] Braun, p. 223; Christensen, pp. 489–90; Hoffman, p. 95.

[56] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2203.

[57] Zotenberg, III, p. 373.

[58] Devos (p. 95) identifies the father of Shīrīn the martyr as a *dihqān*.

[59] Balādhurī, p. 251; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2036; Yāqūt, I, p. 363; Zotenberg, III, p. 331.

[60] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2037; Zotenberg, III, pp. 330–1.

[61] Balādhurī, p. 342; Zotenberg, III, pp. 402–3.

[62] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2030.

[63] Ibid., p. 2386; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 166.

[64] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2029.

[65] At the time of the conquest, the Aramaean *dihqān* Salūbā b. Nistūnā was lord (*ṣāḥib*) of Quss an-Nāṭif and of most of the land between two branches of the Euphrates in the Sawad of Ḥīra (Abū Yūsuf, p. 225; Balādhurī, pp. 244–5; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2017, 2019; 2049–52; Yaqūt, I, pp. 483–4). There is also a reference to an Arab *dihqān* killed at 'Ain at-Tamr at the time of the conquest (Abū Yūsuf, p. 226).

[66] The mother of Ziyād and the parents of Ḥasan al-Basrī were lower class Persians and came from this part of Iraq (Balādhurī, p. 344).

[67] Scher, II (2), pp. 587–8.

[68] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2426–7.

[69] Ibid., pp. 2442–3.

family followed by the high nobles, the *shahārija*, and at least two grades of *dahāqīn*. At the bottom was the peasantry, some of whom were of Persian origin but who probably had been Aramaicized. At least, it is reasonable to suppose that in the early seventh century only the most recent arrivals were still Persian.

The Islamic conquest seriously altered the nature of the Persian presence in seventh-century Iraq, but a proper evaluation of its effects must be preceded by a consideration of two pre-Islamic developments. The general impression of a shift in population from the districts east of the Tigris to new urban concentrations around the garrison cities of Baṣra and Kūfa in lower Iraq affected Persians as well as non-Persians in Iraq. But the depopulation of the districts east of the Tigris, along the Diyāla river and the Nahrawān canal system, seems to have begun before the conquest and to have been the consequence of the Byzantine–Persian war in the reign of Khusrau II Parvīz. According to Robert Adams, "... a comparison of Sassanian with Early Islamic settlement makes clear that a substantial retraction occurred before the Islamic period both in the extent and density of occupation," in this part of Iraq.[70] Some 58 per cent of the settled part of the Diyāla region was not soon reoccupied after the fall of the Sasanians and at most the settlement in this region in the early Muslim period amounted to only 64 per cent of what it had been before the end of the Sasanian period.[71] Nor did the location of the sites in the early Muslim period necessarily correspond to late Sasanian sites in the same region. Again, according to Adams:

> ... terminal Sassanian and early Islamic settlements in these areas often neatly alternated with one another along the same canal branches. Since in most cases the early Islamic sites were newly settled after Sassanian times, this suggests that the Sassanian abandonment was associated with a social upheaval sufficient to break off the tradition of residence at most of the Sassanian sites; on the other hand, the early Islamic occupation along the same watercourses, and with roughly comparable population density, suggests that the interval of disuse could not have been very long.[72]

The " social upheaval sufficient to break off the tradition of residence " is identified by Adams with the campaign of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius in the Tigris valley in 627 and 628.[73] Firstly, not only agriculture but urban life declined in this part of Iraq during the seventh century as the result of pestilence, earthquakes, and famine. The village of Nahr Zāwar near 'Ukbarā was deserted in the reign of Shīrōē (Qubādh II, 628–9) and a presbyter in the village church named David settled in the village of Bēth Daqlē in Bēth Garmē.[74] Secondly, the extensive flooding in the districts below Kaskar in 628 must have affected the fortunes of the house of Narsī, to say nothing of the peasants there.

Immediately following these developments, the Muslim conquest was responsible for changes in the distribution of Persians in Iraq wrought by the combined effects of death, captivity, defection, and migration. One of the most important consequences of the conquest was the physical disappearance, either through death on the battlefield or by flight, of large numbers of Persian soldiers, aristocrats, and the royal family itself. Unfortunately the figures preserved in the Arabic accounts of the conquest are thoroughly inflated and legendary and serve only to emphasize the extent of the dislocation. According to Arab tradition, in the first sweep which Khālid b. al-Walīd made coming up along the border of lower Iraq from the Yamāma, 70,000 people, most of whom were from Amghīshayā, are said to have been killed at Ullais. Afterwards, Amghīshayā itself was razed and its remaining population scattered in the countryside.[75] After the fall of Ḥīra, the leader of a troop of Persian cavalry, Farrukhbandādh, was killed at Bāniqyā and his forces put to flight.[76] At 'Ain at-Tamr the main Persian force

[70] R. Adams, *Land Behind Baghdad* (Chicago, 1965), p. 74.
[71] Ibid., pp. 81, 99.
[72] Ibid., 81–2.
[73] Adams, p. 81; Agapius of Manbij, *Kitāb al-'Unwān*, II (2) *Patrologia Orientalis*, VIII (1912), p. 464; Nöldeke, pp. 294–6; Scher, II (2), pp. 541–2; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 1003–5; Zotenberg, II, p. 308.
[74] Hoffmann, pp. 77–8.
[75] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2036–7. Somewhat schematically Abū Yūsuf (pp. 219–20) says that Khalid massacred the Persian garrisons at al-'Udhaib and Najaf, took their women and children captive and made peace with the people of Qādisiyya for the payment of the poll tax.
[76] Abū Yūsuf, p. 225; Balādhurī, p. 244. According to the Chronicle of Siirt, when the Muslims conquered Ḥīra, they killed the Persians there (Scher, II (2), p. 625), but since *dahāqīn* survived at Ḥīra, only the garrison must be meant.

under Mihrān b. Bahrām Chūbīn fled after the defeat of their Arab auxiliaries by Khālid, and when the place fell, all of the defenders were killed.[77] At Anbār, after an engagement outside the city, the soldiers of the garrison under Shīrzādh were allowed to withdraw leaving all of their possessions behind.[78] Along the Syrian border, the three fortresses of Ḥuṣaid, Khanāfis and Muṣayyakh were reduced. At Ḥuṣaid, large numbers of Persians were killed along with the two commanders Zarmihr and Rūzbih, while at Muṣayyakh the entire garrison under Mahbūdhān were killed in a dawn attack.[79] On the other hand, Anōshagān son of Gushnaspmah came to terms with Khālid for the people in his stronghold.[80]

Khālid's raid was followed by a Persian counter-attack in the Sawād, where many of the temporary arrangements that the local authorities had made with the Muslims were annulled (forcibly or otherwise) by the Persians, who tried to restore the border and rally their forces for the defence of the Sawād. Narsī was made personally responsible for the protection of the interests of the royal family in lower Iraq, where along with the two sons of Bisṭām the uncle of Parvīz, Bindawai and Tīrawai, who were his own cousins, he attempted to raise local resistance to protect Kaskar from Muslim raids.[81] The Persian riposte was crowned with success at the battle of the Bridge, where the Muslim army under Abū 'Ubaid was decisively defeated, and Abū 'Ubaid himself was killed. Thereafter the leadership of the Muslim forces passed to a local Arab, al-Muthannā b. Ḥāritha, who was able to wear down the Persians by a series of raids and finally to defeat them at the battle of Buwaib. It was only after Buwaib that the remaining Persian border posts (*manāẓir*) along the desert frontier were reduced, particularly Ḥiṣn Malīqiyā and the positions at aṭ-Ṭaff.[82]

The issue in the Euphrates districts was only decided by the battle of Qādisiyya, a military disaster for the Persians in which their general, Rustam, fell on the battlefield and the army was routed. The fugitives were pursued by the Muslim captains Zuhra and Qa'qā', who are said to have killed them in every village, reed thicket, and river bank.[83] The remnants of the Persian army collected at Bābil under Nakhīrjān, Mihrān ar-Rāzī, Hurmuzān and Fairuzān, and attempted to make a stand. Fairuzān was put in charge by the others, but they were defeated by the Muslim vanguard under Zuhra and scattered once again.[84] Hurmuzān retired to Ahwāz and his property at Mihrjān Qadhaq, and Fairuzān went off to Nahāwand, where he seized the royal treasures[85] while Zuhra's force pursued those Persians fleeing towards the capital. When he drove them out of Sūrā, two more noblemen, Fayumān from Maisān and Farrukhān from Ahwāz, were killed.[86] At Kūthā the *dihqān* of al-Bāb, Shahriyār, was killed after he was abandoned by Nakhīrjān, who fled to Madā'in along with Mihrān ar-Rāzī.[87]

As the main Muslim army under Sa'd approached the capital, the Persians attempted to make another stand. At Ṣābāt an entire squadron of soldiers, having sworn that they would not outlive the Persian state, were cut down.[88] After a brief attempt to defend Bahurasīr that city was evacuated by Nakhīrjān and Mihrān ar-Rāzī, together with the garrison, who retired to the east bank of the Tigris, cutting the floating bridge behind them.[89] Across the river the eastern half of Madā'in was subjected to a siege by Sa'd for a month and a half before the Persians again evacuated it. This time it was not only the garrison that fled, but, led by Yazdagerd III and the royal family, the aristocratic population of the city as well.[90] While Farrukhzādh is said to have been left behind in charge at Madā'in,[91] Mihrān and Nakhīrjān were made responsible for the evacuation of the royal treasure.[92] The road from Madā'in to Ḥulwān now became clogged with refugees and soldiers while the Muslim vanguard hovered at their rear, cutting off stragglers and collecting their weapons and other possessions as booty.[93]

[77] Abū Yūsuf, p. 226; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2063–4.
[78] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2060.
[79] Ibid., pp. 2068–70.
[80] Balādhurī, p. 340.
[81] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2168–9; Zotenberg, III, p. 371.
[82] Balādhurī, p. 254.
[83] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2341.
[84] Ibid., pp. 2420–1.
[85] Ibid., p. 2521.
[86] Ibid., pp. 2421–2.
[87] Ibid., pp. 2421, 2423. At the same time the Persian troops stationed in upper Iraq, particularly at Sinjār, were evacuated (Abū Yūsuf, p. 64).
[88] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2359, 2425. They appear to have been a special unit formed by Queen Būrān and led by a man who had been one of her favourites.
[89] Ibid., pp. 2421, 2429.
[90] Balādhurī, p. 263; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2357–8, 2439, 2441–2; Tha'ālibī, p. 739; Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 165.
[91] Tha'ālibī, p. 739.
[92] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2439–40.
[93] Ibid., pp. 2440, 2446–7; Zotenberg, III, p. 415.

Halfway to Ḥulwān, the Persian rearguard made an attempt to cover the retreat. The baggage and dependents were entrenched at Khāniqīn while what must have been a major Persian force under Khurrazād, the brother of Rustam, met a Muslim force of 12,000 under Hāshim b. 'Utba b. Abī Waqqāṣ at Jalūlā'. The Arabic tradition claims that the Persians suffered 100,000 casualties at Jalūlā', in any case, it was a second major disaster which left their dependents and property all but unprotected at Khāniqīn. While Hāshim stayed at Jalūlā', a flying column under Qa'qā' b. 'Amr pursued the survivors to Khāniqīn, where every fighting man who could be caught, including Mihrān ar-Rāzī who had fled from Jalūlā', was killed.[94] When he heard of the defeat at Jalūlā' and the death of Mihrān, Yazdagerd abandoned Ḥulwān and headed for Rayy, leaving the troops at Ḥulwān under Khusrawshunūm. The last major engagement in the campaign was that fought at Qaṣr-i Shīrīn between Khusrawshunūm and Qa'qā', in which the Persians were again defeated and Khusrawshunūm put to flight.[95]

About the same time as Sa'd's campaign through central Iraq a separate expedition under 'Utba b. Ghazwān produced a similar dislocation, mainly affecting the Persian garrison troops and local nobles, in southeastern Iraq. All of the 4,000 horsemen (*ūswār*) with which the lord (*ṣāḥib*) of Furāt attacked 'Utba at the site of Baṣra, are said to have been killed and the lord of Furāt taken captive.[96] The *marzbān* of Dast-i Maisān was captured and killed by 'Utba,[97] and at Madhār a Persian force was routed with 30,000 casualties, while the *marzbān* and lord (*ṣāhib*) of Madhār was captured and beheaded.[98]

The location of Persians in Iraq was also altered by the way Muslims took captive the noncombatants and dependents associated with the Persian army and administration. Peasants were generally left unmolested as long as they did not resist, for the Muslims were mainly interested in taking captive the sons of military men who knew Persian methods and procedures.[99] There are at least two explicit examples of this practice in operation. In one case, in the course of the conquest of upper Iraq, a *marzbān* was captured and put to death while his children were spared.[100] In the second case, in the process of quelling a rising at Nahr Tīrā on the border between the Sawād of Baṣra and Ahwāz in 23/644, sixty young men (*ghulām*) who were the sons of *dahāqīn* were taken captive. In this case, however, the young men were ransomed and the amount divided among the Muslims.[101]

The initial result of captivity was the physical removal of a large number of Persian women and children from Iraq, most of whom were sent off to Madīna with the other booty. According to Ya'qūbī, Khālid had taken captives at Kaskar and Bāniqiyā.[102] At Ullais captives are said to have been taken as never before,[103] and at 'Ain at-Tamr, after the garrison was slaughtered, all of the non-combatants in the fortress were taken captive.[104] After Khālid left for Syria, in the campaign that led up to the battle of the Bridge, more captives were taken at Zandaward,[105] and at Bītīq in Nahr Jawbar.[106] It was at this time that the procession conveying the daughter of Āzādhbih to her new husband at Sinnīn was intercepted, and she was captured along with thirty women of the *dahāqīn* and one hundred attendants.[107] Captives were also taken at Ubulla when it fell to 'Utba b. Ghazwān.[108]

The longer the Muslims remained in Iraq, the less likely it was for captives to be sent back to Madīna. As successful campaigns led to permanent occupation, the result of the advance of Muslim armies to the east and north was to rearrange the Persian population in Iraq. The dependents of

[94] Balādhurī, pp. 264–5; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2460, 2464, 2473. Fairuzān managed to escape from Jalūlā', but somewhere along the line, certainly after the fall of Madā'in, a man called Nakhīrkhan was defeated and killed at Dair Ka'b. He is most probably to be identified with Nakhīrjān (Balādhurī, p. 262).

[95] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2473.

[96] Ibid., p. 2379.

[97] Ibid., pp. 2385–6.

[98] Balādhurī, p. 342; Ibn Sa'd, *Kitāb aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr* (Leiden, 1915), VII (1), p. 3; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2028. After 'Utba returned to Madina, one of the *dahāqīn* of Maisān who had come to terms rebelled and was killed by Mughīra b. Shu'ba at al-Mun'araj (Balādhurī, p. 343).

[99] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2026, 2031.

[100] A. Mingana, *Sources syriaques* (Leipzig, 1908), p. 230.

[101] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2710–11.

[102] Ya'qūbī, II, p. 147.

[103] Abū Yūsuf, pp. 219–20; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2036–7.

[104] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2063–4. These captives who were probably the dependants of the Persian garrison should be distinguished from the captives taken from the town of 'Ain at-Tamr who were Arabs.

[105] Balādhurī, p. 251.

[106] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2170.

[107] Ibid., p. 2233; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 163.

[108] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2384–5. Khālid is also said to have sent Ma'qil b. Muqarrin al-Muzanī to take the booty and captives from Ubulla (Ibid., p. 2025).

the Persian army defeated at Jalūlā' were taken captive at Khāniqīn, including, it is said, a daughter or grand-daughter of Khusrau II Parvīz named Manjāna. Since their captors returned to Madā'in and ultimately settled in Kūfa, there is good reason to believe that at least a number of captive Persian women and children were also settled at Kūfa.[109] Some of the veterans of Qādisiyya also settled in Baṣra, so it is also reasonable to suppose that some of these captives were taken there. One of the best examples of the way captive Persians were relocated within Iraq is the story of Joseph Hazzaya. His father was the *mōbadh* of Nimrūd in upper Iraq, and when the city fell to a Muslim army, Joseph, a child of seven at the time, was taken prisoner along with 130 other people. He was eventually sold to an Arab of Sinjār who had him circumcised, but three years later the Arab died and his children sold Joseph to a Christian in Qardū named Cyriacus. Growing up in this household, Joseph was converted to Christianity by the monks of a nearby monastery and was freed by his master.[110]

The way the Persian population of Iraq was redistributed by carrying captive women and children off to the Ḥijāz or by relocating them in the new Muslim garrison towns of Baṣra and Kūfa as *mawālī*, both contributed to the depopulation of the districts east of the Tigris and also added to the new concentration of population in lower Iraq, which was increased still further by those returning from the Ḥijāz and by new Persian captives brought from the Iranian plateau. A number of the captives taken to the Ḥijāz, or their children, made their way back to Iraq. Among the captives taken in Maisān in 14/635 was a certain Arṭabān who became a convert to Islam and ultimately settled in Baṣra as the *mawlā* of 'Abd Allāh b. Durra b. Sarāq al-Muzanī in the caliphate of 'Umar I.[111] The most famous example, of course, is that of Ḥaṣan al-Baṣrī, whose father was taken captive in Maisān and brought to the Ḥijāz. Ḥaṣan was raised in the Wādī l-Qurā north of Madīna, but eventually he settled in Baṣra where he spent the rest of his life.[112] Likewise, most of the prisoners brought back by the Muslim armies which conquered the Iranian plateau were taken to slave markets in Baṣra or Kūfa and redistributed from there, with the result that the initial ethnic dislocation produced by the killing or flight of large numbers of Persians in the course of the conquest was offset by a new, forcible Persian immigration to the cities of lower Iraq. The best known example of this is the case of Ṣāliḥ b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, both of whose parents were taken captive near Zaranj in Sīstān in 30/650–1 and who were sold in the slave market in Baṣra.[113]

In addition to those Persians whose condition and location were affected forcibly by the conquest, a number of Persian soldiers managed to preserve themselves by coming to terms with the conquerors. Among the first to go over to the winning side were a group of Persians called the *Ḥamrā'* who became converts to Islam and joined the Muslim army, some before the battle of Qādisiyya, some afterwards. They were integrated into the Muslim army as allies of the Arab tribe of Tamīm and participated in the division of the booty at Qādisiyya, where they received shares equal to those of the Arabs in the army.[114] Afterwards they took part in Sa'd's campaign and formed part of the advance guard under Qa'qā' after the battle of Jalūla'. They were with Qa'qā' at Khāniqīn, where the dependents of the Persian army were taken captive, and after the fall of Ḥulwān, Qa'qā' settled the *Ḥamrā'* there as a border garrison under their leader, a man named Qubādh.[115] Some members of the *Ḥamrā'* were settled as far away as Sāmān, one of the subdistricts (*rustāq*) of Māh Dīnār on the border of the province (*arḍ*) of Iṣfahān.[116] But some of them must have returned to Kūfa with the Muslim army, because in 51/671 a man of the *Ḥamrā'* was involved in a brawl in the mosque in Kūfa.[117] In fact, the *Ḥamrā'* may

[109] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2359, 2464, 2473. In addition to the captives taken at Khāniqīn, some Persian cavalrymen were captured in the evacuation of Bahurasīr (Ibid., p. 2340), and Sa'd is said to have taken 12,000 Persian horsemen captive at Madā'in (*Ibid.*, p. 2451). One of the women taken capitve at Jalūlā' was the mother of Abū 'Amr 'Āmir ash-Sha'bī b. Sharāhil (MacGuckin de Slane, *Ibn Khallikan's Biographical Dictionary* (New York and London, repr. 1961), II, pp. 4–6). The presence of these people at Kūfa is also suggested by the genealogy of Abū l-Qāsim Ḥammād (Ḥammād ar-Rāwiya) b. Abī Laila Sāpūr b. al-Mubārak b. 'Ubaid ad-Dailamī al-Kūfī (b. 95/713–14, d. 155/772), who was a *mawlā* of the Arab tribe of Bakr b. Wa'il at Kūfa (Ibid., I, p. 473). Among the early traditionalists at Kūfā was a *mawlā* of the Banī Wāliba clan of the tribe of Asad named Hurmuz Abū Khālid al-Wālibī, who told traditions on the authority of 'Alī (Ibn Sa'd, VI, p. 159).

[110] Chabot, pp. 64–5, 278.

[111] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2387; Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), p. 88.

[112] Balādhurī, pp. 247, 344; de Slane, I, pp. 370–3; Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), p. 114; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2029, 2387.

[113] Balādhurī, pp. 300–1.

[114] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2261.

[115] Ibid., pp. 2473–4. Qubādh was a native of Khurāsān.

[116] Ibid., II, p. 992.

[117] Ibid., p. 118.

have been identical with a corps of 4,000 Dailamīs formed by Khusrau II Parvīz and called the *Jund Shahānshāh*. They accepted Islam in exchange for security at Qādisiyya, became allies of the Banū Tamīm, and as a unit received one million dirhams in stipends. They were present at the fall of Madā'in and settled in Kūfa, and were kept intact as a unit until the governorship of Ziyād, when some of them were sent to Syria and others to Baṣra, perhaps because of the trouble they were causing.[118]

While the Dailamīs are likely to have been infantry, there were also large numbers of heavy, mailed cavalry (*usvārān, asāwira*) who went over to the Muslim side. The main group of *asāwira* was the force under Siyāh al-Uswārī which formed the vanguard of Yazdagerd's army when the latter headed for Iṣfahān after abandoning Ḥulwān. Siyāh was sent on ahead from Iṣfahān towards Iṣṭakhr with 300 men, seventy of whom were members of the high aristocracy and army officers. He was told to gather other soldiers along the way, and from Fārs, Siyāh turned westwards into Ahwāz where his force settled at Kalbāniyya, probably as a defence against the Muslims at Baṣra. Siyāh eventually became a Muslim when Abū Mūsa al-Ash'arī was governor of Baṣra and the *asāwira* settled there.[119] Their numbers were increased by other elements in the Persian army who heard of the successful accommodation they had made and came to Baṣra to join them, especially landless Persian soldiers who became converts to Islam and settled in Baṣra.[120]

Apart from the involuntary settlement of captives and *mawālī* and the voluntary gravitation of defectors from the Persian army to Baṣra and Kūfa, a third factor contributing to the new concentration of Persians in lower Iraq following the Muslim conquest was the way in which individual Persians tended to be attracted to the cities of the new rulers. This type of migration is rather difficult to document because it was generally anonymous, but it is suggested by the accounts of several persons. Rūzbih b. Buzurjmihr b. Sāsān was a native of Hamadān who had been assigned to the Byzantine border at the end of the Sasanian period, but had begun to smuggle weapons across the border to the west. Fearing he was about to be discovered, he went over to the Byzantines, but after the Muslim conquest he felt it was safe again, returned to Iraq, and joined Sa'd at Kūfa where he is given credit for building the citadel (*qaṣr*) and mosque.[121] In the early eighth century another nobleman, Mahān b. Bahmān b. Nusk, migrated from Arrajān in Khuzistān to Kūfa.[122] The inclusion of lower-class Persians in this movement is suggested by a reference to a Persian *'ilj* who went to Baṣra sometime prior to 64/683, where he became a Muslim and became associated with the Khawārij.[123] But such migration did not always involve conversion to Islam. There were Magian butchers at Baṣra and a Persian called Bar Sahdē, who died in 745 at the age of ninety, is said to have migrated from Iṣṭakhr to Baṣra, where he received instruction in the Nestorian Christian schools and became a monk.[124]

It is likely that the migration of Persians to Iraq was encouraged by the confiscation of the property of fire temples in Iṣṭakhr in the reign of Mu'āwiya, followed by the depredations of the Azāriqa sect of Khawārij at the end of the seventh century.

These dislocations and shifts in the pattern of Persian settlement and distribution in Iraq following the conquest were balanced by the fact that significant portions of the Sasanian landed aristocracy managed to survive through coming to terms with and even aiding the conquerors. In Khālid's first raid through lower Iraq, tribute was imposed on the people of Ḥīra in return for a peace treaty,[125] and Zādh b. Buhaish was allowed to make terms for Furāt Siryā.[126] An annual tribute was imposed on the people of Anbār in return for peace following the departure of the garrison.[127] During Abū 'Ubaid's follow-up campaign, the people of Ullais avoided a repetition of what had happened during Khālid's raid and exchanged tribute for peace.[128] Following Abū 'Ubaid's victory over local forces at Kaskar in 13/634, several *dahāqīn* also made peace for their districts in return for a poll tax of four dirhams per person: Farrūkh b. Andarzaghar for Bārūsmā, Farwandādh for Nahr Jawbar, and the *dihqān* of Zawābī for this district.[129]

[118] Balādhurī, p. 280.
[119] Ibid., pp. 372–4.
[120] Ibid., p. 374.
[121] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2494–5.
[122] de Slane, I, pp. 20–2.
[123] Ṭabarī, II, p. 461.
[124] Chabot, pp. 230–1.
[125] Balādhurī, p. 243; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2017–19, 2044–5, 2350; Yaḥyā b. Ādam, *Kitāb al-Kharāj. Taxation in Islam*, I (Leiden, 1958), p. 47; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 147; Zotenberg, III pp. 321, 333.
[126] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2050–1.
[127] Yaqūt, I, p. 368.
[128] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2019; Yaḥyā b. Ādam, p. 26.
[129] Balādhurī, p. 251; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2170; Zotenberg, III, p. 373.

But the validity of these agreements seems to have been seriously compromised in the course of the Persian counter-attack, especially after the battle of the Bridge. The Persians may have forced some of the people in lower Iraq to violate their agreements with the Muslims,[130] but, on the whole, the *dahāqīn* appear to have tried to accommodate the side which seemed to be winning at the moment, and Zādh b. Buhaish commanded the Persian infantry at the battle of Qādisiyya.[131]

After the Muslim victory at Qādisiyya the *dahāqīn* of the Sawād were offered and accepted the option of protection and inviolability in return for paying taxes. Even those who had fled were allowed to return although they were subjected to heavier taxes. Although the Magian organization and hierarchy disappeared in Iraq with the conquest and fire temples were confiscated by the Muslims as state property, individual Magian Persians were included in the blanket arrangements for tribute at Ḥīra, Anbār, and Madā'in. The people in the White Palace at Madā'in were allowed to pay taxes in return for protection when the city fell and these terms were extended to the rest of the population of the city which returned after the fighting was over.[132] Similar terms were also made for the people of Takrīt,[133] of Bandanīkān,[134] and at Mahrūdh.[135] In the final settlement after the battle of Jalūlā', those *dahāqīn* who survived were left with their lands but were made responsible to the Muslim régime for the taxes.[136]

Consequently, apart from the new concentration of Persians in Baṣra and Kūfa following the conquest, the Sasanian pattern of settlement in Iraq tended to be preserved by the pre-Islamic class of nobles living in towns as absentee landlords or on their estates in the countryside. While Madā'in was no longer the capital of an empire and Kūfa overshadowed it in size and importance, it continued to be an important centre for local administration. The real blow to the prosperity and importance of Madā'in would appear to have been the Khārijī sack of the city in 68/687, when men, women, and children were indiscriminately slaughtered, but which was probably restricted to the Muslim quarters.[137] Thereafter Madā'in survived as a small city until the foundation of Baghdād.[138] Ḥulwān, Ṣaimara and Sīrawān along the northeast border of Iraq continued to have Persian populations mixed with Arabs and Kurds.[139] In the agricultural districts along the Nahrawān canal east of the Tigris, the town of Dair al-'Āqūl continued to be inhabited by noble landowners, although the town was smaller in the Islamic period than it had been under the Sasanians.[140] Likewise Jarjarāyā, the administrative seat of the lower Nahrawān district, continued to be inhabited by the descendants of Persian nobles,[141] as did Mādharāyā on the Tigris below it.[142] The rural nobility continued to live in town at Kaskar even after the founding of Wāsiṭ across the river.[143] In the Sawād of Kūfa, the lowest grade of *dahāqīn* continued to reside in villages and estates in the countryside.[144]

Persian peasants also survived into the Islamic period in Iraq, although in decreasing numbers. Bahūrasīr was eventually reduced to a village occupied by Imāmī Shī'ī *fallāḥīn*.[145] The small villages in

[130] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2369.
[131] Ibid., pp. 2061, 2258, 2472.
[132] Ibid., pp. 2435, 2440.
[133] Ibid., p. 2477. When Ṭirhān and Takrīt were conquered by 'Utba b. Farqad, he made peace with the people in the fortress of Takrīt for themselves and their property, and according to a local shaikh, the people of Takrīt had a *kitāb āmān* in their possession until the raids of the Khārijī al-Jurashī, who tore it up when he laid waste to the villages of Mawṣil (Balādhuri, p. 333).
[134] The people of Bandanīkān made peace with Hāshim b. 'Utba for the payment of *jizya* and *kharāj* (Ibid., p. 265).
[135] Balādhurī, p. 265; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2461.
[136] Dennett, pp. 22–3, 28; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2467–8; Yahyā b. Ādam, pp. 26–7, 52.
[137] Ṭabarī, II, p. 755; Zotenberg, IV, p. 101.
[138] Ibn Ḥawqal, *Kitāb Ṣurāt al-Arḍ*, *BGA* (Leiden, 1938–9), II, p. 244; Iṣṭakhri, *Kitāb Masālik al-Mamālik*, *BGA* (Leiden, 1927), I, p. 86. The army of Sa'd which had occupied Madā'in in 637 had been billeted in the houses vacated by the Persians who had fled from the city, but in 638 the entire army returned to the Euphrates where Kūfa was founded. Those who had been assigned houses in Madā'in by Sa'd took off the doors and brought them to Kūfa where they put them on their new houses (I. Guidi, "Chronica Minora I", *CSCO*, I, *Scriptores Syri*, I, p. 31; *CSCO*, II, *Scriptores Syri*, II, p. 26; Th. Nöldeke, "Die von Guidi herausgegebene syrische Chronik", *SBWAW* Phil.-Hist. Cl., CXXVIII (1893), p. 34; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2451, 2497; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 171). This is the origin of the myth that the Persian population of Madā'in migrated to Kūfa after the conquest. The geographers took the tradition that the population of Kūfa had come from Madā'in (Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2380–1) out of context and claimed that Madā'in lost its inhabitants to Baṣra and Kūfa and then to Wāsiṭ and Baghdad (Qazwīnī, II, p. 303; Yāqūt, IV, p. 447).
[139] Ya'qūbī, *Les pays* (Cairo, 1937), pp. 65–8.
[140] Adams, p. 91; Ya'qūbī, *Les pays*, p. 164.
[141] Ya'qūbī, *Les pays*, p. 164.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid., pp. 165–6.
[144] Ibid., p. 140.
[145] Qazwīnī, II, p. 303. It was one of their customs that their women never went outside during the day.

the countryside around Baṣra continued to be inhabited by Persians,[146] but they were only an extension of the Persian population of Khūzistān, because the Muslim state did not continue the Sasanian policy of transferring the agricultural population at first, and did not settle any new Persian peasants in the Sawād.[147]

Those Persians who survived the conquest maintained their cultural heritage among themselves. The festivals of Nawrūz, Mihrjān, and the Kawsaj continued to be observed by Persians in Iraq. Nawrūz, which was supposed to coincide with the vernal equinox and fell on the first day of Farvardīn, the first month of the year, had served as the beginning of the fiscal year under the Sasanians, the moment at which administrative appointments took effect, and a time for presenting gifts to the sovereign, minting new coins, purifying the fire temples by ceremonial ablutions and sacrifices, and issuing proclamations.[148] This festival was still honoured by Persians in Muslim Iraq as a time for the exchange of gifts.[149] Mihrjān fell on the sixteenth day of the month of Mihr, corresponding to October 26, was supposed to mark the beginning of cold weather, and was also an occasion for presenting gifts to the monarch.[150] The practice of changing the carpets, utensils, and most clothing on that date was continued in Iraq after the conquest as well as the requirement of offering gifts to the ruler.[151] The mid-winter festival of the Kawsaj, on the first day of Ādhurmāh, was also celebrated by Persians in Muslim Iraq. The festival lasted several days and involved eating walnuts, garlic, fattened meat, and drinking beverages regarded as appropriate for combating the cold. During it, a person called the Kawsaj went through the streets mounted on a mule, and when cold water was poured on him, he cried out in Persian, *garmā! garmā!* (" hot! hot! "), a practice that was part of the public rejoicing probably associated with the return of the sun after the winter solstice.[152]

Upper-class Persians who remained Magians preserved privately among their own families their customs of endogamy, the exposure of the dead, and religious education. Magians were still being accused of marrying their mothers, sisters and daughters.[153] Magian customs for disposing of the dead continued into the Muslim period in Iraq where, at the time of the plague of 67/686, the Nestorian writer Bar Penkayē complained that Christians unwilling to bury their dead for fear of contracting the plague imitated the Magians by abandoning even close relatives to be devoured by dogs, ravens and vultures.[154] Formal religious education was no longer available for Magians in Muslim Iraq but was still being provided within Magian families for their children. The best indication of both facts is provided by Rūzbih ('Abd Allāh b. al-Muqaffa' after his conversion to Islam), who was born about 102/720 in Fārs. Before moving to Baṣra, his father had him educated in Persian literature and the Magian religion in Khūzistān.[155] On the other hand, Magian butchers were so numerous at Baṣra as to force at least one scrupulous Muslim to become a vegetarian.[156]

In many ways the survival of these customs amounted to a post-Sasanian cultural afterglow. There is a noticeable tendency for the Persians of early Muslim Iraq to cling to old ways of doing things while the situation was changing around them. They even attempted to impose their outlook and practices on the new set of circumstances. In fact, whether they suffered physical dislocation or not, Persians found themselves faced with significant changes in their social status and with cultural erosion that were mainly due to the loss of political power. To the extent that Iranian cultural traditions were identified with Magianism, the conquest had the effect of accelerating the defection of Magians from their religion, a trend already under way in the late Sasanian period, because it had been replaced as the religion of the ruling class by Islam. The Magian hierarchy and public institutions had all been destroyed in Iraq, and Magians were placed in the position of a subject minority required to pay

[146] Iṣṭakhrī, p. 81; Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 238.
[147] But Zanj were used on the estates in lower Iraq by the end of the seventh century, and Soghdian captives were employed on estates in the Ḥijāz.
[148] Jāḥiẓ, p. 146; Pellat, pp. 165–6.
[149] R. Levy, " Persia and the Arabs ", *The Legacy of Persia* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 65–6.
[150] Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, I, p. 199.
[151] Mas'ūdī, II, p. 492.
[152] Ibid., p. 495.
[153] Ṭabarī, II, p. 586; Thomas of Marghā, II, pp. 606–9. The continuation of endogamy among Magians is also suggested by the order of 'Umar I to Jaz' b. Mu'āwiya at Baṣra in 643 to separate every Magian from his wife and children (Abū Yūsuf, p. 187; Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), p. 94).
[154] Mingana, *Sources syriaques*, I, p. 187.
[155] J. Ghurayyib, *'Abdullāh ibn-ul-Muqaffa'* (Beirut), p. 20; S. D. Goitein, *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions* (Leiden, 1966), p. 151.
[156] Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), p. 77.

tribute in return for religious toleration and military protection. Dennett's conclusion that it was mainly the Persian upper classes who had been exempt from the poll-tax under the Sasanians who became converts to Islam to avoid paying it to the Arabs, while those who had been subject to the poll-tax before the conquest continued to pay it and did not convert, may serve as a useful generalization, but needs to be qualified in several ways. As under the Sasanians, military or civil state service tended to be associated with membership in the religion of the ruling class, and both the *Ḥamrā'* and the *asāwira* who joined the Arab armies and settled in Kūfa and Baṣra became Muslims. The children of Persians who had fallen or fled during the conquest were raised as Muslims and served in the army as *mawālī*. Although state service did not necessarily require conversion to Islam, the right to receive a stipend from the treasury did. The 2,000-dirham stipends paid out to high Persian aristocrats and *dahāqīn* were as powerful an inducement as the way in which conversion excused them from paying the poll tax and left them in possession of their lands.[157] At any rate, by the time of 'Umar II the Magians at Ḥīra had become Muslim.[158]

The Muslim conquest also removed the difficulties attached to apostacy from Magianism, and conversions to Christianity increased in the later seventh century. Particularly in upper Iraq, aristocratic Magian Persians sought alternative paths of advancement, secured their property, and just as easily avoided paying the poll tax, by becoming monks and bishops in the Nestorian Church. By the early eighth century there seem to have been Magians left only at a few out-of-the-way places along the northeast border of Iraq where the population began to be entirely Persian and along the border of Khuzistān and in Baṣra in the south. The few surviving Magians continued to be the objects of efforts by Christians to convert them. When a famous family of Magians in the district of Sawā in Marghā was converted by the miracles of Cyprian of Bēth Magōshē in the eighth century, the most significant way Thomas of Marghā could describe the social consequences of their conversion was to say that they ceased to marry their mothers, sisters, and daughters.[159]

The conquest also altered the nature of the Persian social structure in Iraq. Although enough representatives of the landed aristocracy survived to be able to preserve the main outlines of their graded, class system, according to Løkkegaard[160] the upper levels of this hierarchic society disappeared with the conquest and those members of the high aristocracy who survived tended to be degraded in rank. While this seems to be a perfectly valid judgment, adequate account must be taken of the survival of individuals belonging to the highest level of the Sasanian hierarchy. Mas'ūdī claims that descendents of the Persian kings and members of the traditional four classes continued to live in the Sawād and preserved their hereditary titles.[161] Otherwise, the Arabic tradition is insistent on the point that the Sasanian royal family was proscribed from any settlement in the Sawād, and all it admits is the survival as captives of some of the women of the royal family. This attitude would seem to be tendentious and based on the need to justify the confiscation of the crown lands and royal property in the Sawād by their abandonment through the flight of Yazdagerd III.

Actually, some members of the royal family seem to have preserved their landed interests, at least for a while, by coming to terms with the Muslims. The best example is Bisṭām b. Narsī, who was called *dihqān* of Burs at the time of the conquest. Immediately after Qādisiyya he extended his hospitality to Khālid b. 'Urfūta who was pursuing the remnants of the Persian army, tied the floating bridges together for Zuhra, who was engaged in a similar pursuit, and informed Zuhra of the Persian force gathered at Bābil. Afterwards, as *dihqān* of Bābil and Khutarniyya, his poll-tax was annulled, he was allowed to keep his lands subject to *kharāj*, and he was granted a stipend of 2,000 dirhams by 'Umar I.[162] Fīrūz b. Yazdagerd, who turns up as *dihqān* of Nahr al-Malik after the conquest with a stipend of 2,000 dirhams granted by 'Umar, may also be suspected of being a member of the royal family, as may Rūzbih b.

[157] Balādhurī, p. 265; Dennett, pp. 32–3; Zotenberg, III, p. 461. Persian employees in the administration were paid salaries, of course. The point is that only Persian aristocrats and soldiers who converted to Islam shared in the stipends paid out of the *dīwān* for the support of the Arab military and ruling class.

[158] Abū Yūsuf, p. 202.

[159] Thomas of Marghā, II, pp. 606–9.

[160] Løkkegaard, p. 168.

[161] Mas'ūdī, I, p. 248.

[162] Balādhurī, pp. 259, 457–8; Ṭabarī, I, p. 2421; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 176.

Buzurjmihr b. Sāsān.[163] Other members of the high aristocracy also survived, and the list of those granted 2,000-dirham stipends by 'Umar includes Hurmuzān and the son of Nakhirjān.[164]

The Persian nobles, even members of the high aristocracy, also managed to preserve their local influence and authority by acquiring positions in the Nestorian church organization and by putting their lands under monastic ownership.[165] Beginning with the catholicate of Ishō'yahbh III (647–58), who was himself a member of a family of landed Persian aristocrats, Persian noblemen were appointed metropolitan bishops for P^{e}rāth dh^{e} Maishān (al-Furāt) and Naṣībīn.[166] A certain Beraz Sūrīn became head of the monastery of Bēth 'Ābhē in the late seventh century, and another member of the Sūrēn family tried to use his position as metropolitan bishop of Ḥulwān to capture the office of catholicos in 752, but was deposed.[167] Rūzbihān, a descendent of the Persian nobility settled at Naṣībīn, entered the monastery of Mār Awgīn on Mt. Izlā above the town in the early eighth century. He went on to become superior of the monastery and then metropolitan bishop of Naṣībīn, and while he was metropolitan he gave one of his villages to his former monastery.[168] This pattern is repeated by the career of Shārzādh son of Mihrōē. Born at Kirkūk in *ca.* 732, he, too, became a monk and rose within the Nestorian organization from head of the monastery of Bēth 'Ābhē to be metropolitan of Elam (Khūzistān) and finally to be catholicos (825–32).[169]

In fact, the clearest illustration of the survival of the lower grades of the Persian social hierarchy is to be found among the Christian notables of upper Iraq. Sharījān had helped to defend Takrīt at the time of the conquest, and in 20/641 their strongholds at Tall al-Shahārija and Salāq in Abiabene were taken by 'Utba b. Farqad.[170] But the Shahrījān kept their lands and exercised administrative authority over the lower grade of notables (*dahqānē*) as part of their superior social status, and at Kēfer 'Uzzēl even claimed the right to participate in the election of the Nestorian metropolitan of Adiabene, in spite of the fact that by the eighth century the Shahrījān of Salāq were somewhat heterodox.[171] *Ca.* 780 we find the *dahqānē* accusing the Shahrījān of Salāq to their bishop of appropriating half the grain, wine, nuts, and poll-tax.[172] Shahrījān preserved their class status, perhaps as a kind of sect, in northern Iraq at least until the tenth century, when Ibn Ḥawqal described the town of Kefer 'Uzzā (*sic*) in Arḍ Ḥazza (Adiabene) as a prosperous place with markets and estates (*ḍiyā'*) inhabited by wealthy Christian Shahārija.[173]

It is worth noticing that these lower levels of the Persian social hierarchy survived much longer in the area of Persian settlement in upper Iraq, among Christian Persians, than they did in the Sawād. In lower Iraq all surviving Persian notables tended to be treated as *dahāqīn*, although the distinction between those who lived in town and those who lived in the countryside survived. Here *dahāqīn* kept their land by converting to Islam. In one account a *dihqāna* in the subdistrict of Nahr al-Malik became a Muslim and was allowed to remain on her land if she paid the tax on it.[174] 'Alī is said to have exempted a *dihqān* at 'Ain at-Tamr who became a Muslim from paying the poll-tax, but still required him to pay the land-tax.[175] In 38/658 there is a reference to a native of the Sawād named Zādhānfarrūkh who was a Muslim *dihqān* in the subdistrict of Niffar on the lower Euphrates.[176] At the same time, the *dahāqīn* appear to have enjoyed greater local authority and independence than ever before (or since). The combined effects of the aristocratic reaction that attended the fall of Parvīz in 628, and the way *dahāqīn* were able to secure recognition for their position and privileges from the Muslims at the time of the conquest, tended to increase the power and independence of this class, especially in the fluid conditions immediately following the conquest when they treated lands which had been

[163] Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, II, p. 176.
[164] Balādhurī, pp. 457–8; Yahyā b. Ādam, p. 51; Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, II, p. 176.
[165] This is exactly contemporary to similar behaviour by the Arnulfings in late Merovingian Gaul.
[166] Thomas of Marghā, II, pp. 82, 124, 181–2.
[167] Chabot, pp. 150–1; Elias of Naṣībīn, *CSCO* LXII, *Scriptores Syri*, XXI, pp. 56–7; *CSCO* LXIII, *Scriptores Syri*, XXIII, p. 31.
[168] Chabot, pp. 271–2.
[169] Thomas of Marghā, II, pp. 332–4.
[170] Balādhurī, p. 332; Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2474–5.
[171] Thomas of Marghā, II, pp. 309–10, 383–5.
[172] Ibid., pp. 311–12.
[173] Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 217.
[174] Yahyā b. Ādam, p. 51.
[175] Ibid., p. 52.
[176] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 3423–4.

granted to them by the Sasanian state as their own private property and even seized some of the abandoned Sasanian crown lands for themselves. The mid-seventh century was the heyday of the *dahāqīn* in the Sawād.

These circumstances had two important consequences which ultimately proved fatal to the *dahāqīn* as a class in lower Iraq. In the first place they established ties of common interest with the Muslim Arab aristocracy in the *amṣār*, but in the process some of the rural *dahāqīn* compromised their own position by selling their lands to Muslims and putting themselves under the protection (*talji'a*) of some powerful Muslim patron. Such arrangements were symbolized for the jurists by the story of the *dihqān* who offered to sell his land to 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd, who would only agree to buy it provided the *dihqān* continued to pay *kharāj*.[177] While this situation prevailed in the Sawād of Kūfa, around Baṣra, where landowners near Furāt became Muslims in order to keep their lands or alienated them to Muslim Arabs by gift or sale, such land paid the tithe (*'ushr*) instead of *kharāj*.[178] Unfortunately for the *dahāqīn*, these arrangements tied their fortunes to those of the local Muslim Arab aristocracy in Iraq.

Secondly, the *dahāqīn* made themselves indispensable in local administration. By the reign of Mu'āwiya they served as agents in the assessment, registration, and collection of taxes for the Muslims, and were instrumental in the recovery of the Sasanian register of crown property for the Muslim state.[179] It was only at the end of the Sufyānid period under 'Ubaid Allāh b. Ziyād that the practice of employing the *dahāqīn* to collect taxes in the Sawād became regular,[180] while under Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr, one of the landed nobility, Sārzādh, the lord (*ṣāḥib*) of Bādhīn, was financial secretary for Baṣra.[181] Compromised by such collaboration during the Second Civil War, the *dahāqīn*, along with the tribal aristocracy of the *amṣār*, were ruined by the failure of the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath in 82/701. Ḥajjāj accused them of supporting the rebels, required the land around Furāt to pay *kharāj*, and refused to repair the breaches in the irrigation system along the lower Tigris. Since the *dahāqīn* could not afford to repair the dykes themselves, their land remained unproductive, and when Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik was put in charge of the land reclaimed from the swamps of lower Iraq by his brother, the caliph al-Walīd I (705–15), many local landholders put their land under his protection and were reduced to the condition of tenants.[182] Victims of the centralizing policies of the Umayyad restoration, from this point onwards the *dahāqīn* declined as a class of landed aristocrats in this part of Iraq.

Thus the effect of the Muslim conquest on the Sasanian social system was to eliminate the highest ranks and temporarily to suppress the clothing code. Individual members of the high aristocracy, and probably even of the Sasanian royal family, maintained some status by going over to Islam and becoming part of the new ruling class. Others preserved their status and their lands by acquiring positions of leadership in the Nestorian Church. The *dahāqīn* were willing to co-operate with the Muslims as a matter of survival, but by the eighth century were being displaced by a new class of Muslim Arab landlords. Already *ca.* 670, Isaac of Nineveh described the world as a place of transition for successive generations in terms that might have been meant as an epitaph for the Persian aristocracy:

> They have entered it as an inn for a night and left it as travellers on a journey over the whole earth, without thinking of return. Some of them kings, some governors, some wise, some honoured. Some of them scribes, some orators, some judges, some commanders of armies. Some of them possessors of riches, some lords of goods. And now after their death there is neither the order of their degrees, nor the crowns of their government; nor their dreadful thrones, nor their lordly pleasures, nor the praise of those who honoured them . . ."[183]

The change in status and social context was even greater for Persian captives and defectors who settled in the garrison cities as the *mawālī* or allies (*aḥlāf*) of Arab clans or tribes. *Mawālī* tended to be integrated into Arab tribal society as individuals and acquired the status of their patrons or the clan to which they were attached. Some of them were able to rise to important administrative or military

[177] Yaḥyā b. Ādam, p. 49.
[178] Balādhurī, p. 368.
[179] Dennett, pp. 29–30; Løkkegaard, p. 111; Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, II, p. 258.
[180] Ṭabarī, II, p. 458.
[181] Jahshiyārī, p. 40; Latz, p. 91.
[182] Balādhurī, pp. 67, 293–4.
[183] A. J. Wensinck, "Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh", *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, XXIII (Amsterdam, 1923), pp. 154–5.

positions by the early Umayyad period. The only Persians to keep a group identity in Arab society were the military units which became allies of the tribe of Tamīm: the Dailamīs at Kūfa and the *asāwira* at Baṣra. They were valued as allies, and the argument at Baṣra over which Arab tribe or clan would have them produced a split among the *asāwira* between Shīrōē al-Uswārī, who wanted to settle with Khālid b. al-Mu'ammar and the Banī Sadūs of the tribe of Bakr b. Wā'il, and Siyāh who refused. Siyāh won and the *asāwira* settled with the Banī Sa'd of the tribe of Tamīn. Lots were laid out for them to build homes along the canal called the Nahr al-Asāwira, which was dug for them by 'Abd Allāh b. 'Āmir. Shīrōē went on to establish rather close personal relations with the family of Ziyād in Baṣra and married a lady named Marjāna (possibly the Sasanian pricess called Manjāna taken captive at Khāniqīn), who had borne 'Ubaid Allāh to Ziyād, for whom he built a palace with a thousand gates (*al-Hazārdar*) on a canal in Baṣra named after Umm Ḥabīb, the daughter of Ziyād.[184]

The *asāwira* survived fairly intact as a military unit and community at Baṣra for over half a century. During the First Civil War they were campaigning in Khurāsān with 'Abd Allāh b. 'Āmir, and avoided becoming compromised by participation in the battle of the Camel or the battle of Ṣiffīn. All the same, in 42/662 Mu'āwiya is said to have transferred some of the *asāwira* from Baṣra and Kūfa to Antioch. It was really their involvement in the Second Civil War on the side of Maṣ'ūd b. az-Zubair and then their participation in the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath that proved their ruin. In retribution, Ḥajjāj destroyed their houses in Baṣra, reduced their stipends, and deported some of them.[185] Thereafter they disappeared as a separate element in Baṣran society, although the name of a certain 'Alī al-Uswārī is attached to the Mu'tazila.[186]

It should be noted that the disbanding of the *asāwira* coincided with the ruining of the *dahāqīn*, the conversion of the Magians at Ḥīra to Islam, the change of the language of the tax bureau from Persian to Arabic, and the coinage reform. These almost-simultaneous changes underscore the impression that most of the direct survivals from the Sasanian period lasted for about sixty years after the conquest, until *ca.* 700, before they either disappeared or were integrated into a new Islamic civilization.

In the interval captives, defectors, and *dahāqīn* provided important channels for the transmission of Persian culture to Muslim Arabs. Their very survival, the way in which they continued to live as Persians to the best of their ability under the changed conditions, and assumed that they should approach their new rulers as they had been accustomed to deal with the Sasanian authorities, their employment as scribes and tax collectors by the Muslim state, combined with the ethnically mixed conditions in and around the garrison towns where Persian was spoken along with Arabic and where from the beginning there were bilingual Persians and Arabs who could communicate with each other, contributed to the effectiveness of such cultural influences. The sons of Persian soldiers served in the Muslim army as *mawālī*. Persian women and children introduced Persian domestic organization into Muslim Arab households as concubines, slaves, and servants. These conditions are reflected in the way a *ghulām* is described presenting Abū l-'Āliyya (d. 90/708), himself a *mawlā*, with the gift of a sealed handkerchief of hard sugar (*qand*) at Baṣra,[187] or by the scene in which the caliph 'Alī is represented as witnessing the playing of chess (*shaṭranj*) in Kūfa.[188] At Baṣra, where Persians practiced the double sale for the purpose of taking interest, the objection voiced by Muwarriq b. al-Mushamrij al-'Ijli, " I detest the resale with specification of gain ten-eleven and ten-twelve," quotes the numbers in Persian (*dah yāzdah* and *dah davāzdah*).[189] Also at Baṣra, Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī in 23/644 is supposed to have had a slave girl named 'Aqīla who served him lunch and dinner in a bowl, which no-one else was able to have done for him.[190]

The importance of the *dahāqīn* in preserving and transmitting Persian customs is indicated by the account of two slave girls belonging to the highest grade of Persian nobility (*min abnā' il-mulūk*) who

[184] Balādhurī, pp. 358, 373–4. An alternative explanation of the name of Hazārdar offered in the text is that a Sasanian king had settled 1,000 *asāwira* there.

[185] Balādhurī, pp. 117, 374.

[186] C. Pellat, *Le milieu baṣrien et la formation de Ǧāḥiẓ*, (Paris, 1953), p. 35.

[187] Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), p. 83.

[188] Ibid., VI, p. 156. The purpose of this story is to allow 'Alī to express his objections to the use of images.

[189] Ibid., VII (1), p. 157. In this case an Arab of the tribe of 'Ijl may be suspected of combining Christian objections to usury with the Qur'ānic prohibition.

[190] Ṭabarī, I, p. 2711. Abū Mūsā was also accused of possessing a treacherous *ghulām*, a table, and a *birdhawn* when he was governor of Baṣra for 'Umar (Jahshiyārī, p. 16; Latz, p. 68).

were taken captive at Marv, brought to Iraq and turned over to a *dihqān* who regarded it as an honour to extend his hospitality to them, spread out silken cloth for them, served them from golden dishes, and sent them back to Khurāsān.[191] The *dahāqīn* assumed that they should treat their Arab masters the same way, but were met with a good deal of initial Arab resistance to being assimilated into local society in this way. Most of the accounts of such encounters appear to be tendentious in one way or another, usually involving early definitions of piety, and perhaps egalitarian attitudes, in contradistinction to aristocratic Persian practices. What seems to have been a real cultural issue for the first century of Islam appears also to have been further complicated by *shu'ūbī* and anti-*shu'ūbī* tendencies in the way the early accounts were treated. In any case, both the way in which the *dahāqīn* assumed that they should deal with the Arabs according to their own customs, and the characteristic immediate Arab reaction, are nicely illustrated by the story of how, after the battle of Kaskar during the conquest, two of the *dahāqīn* of the Sawād, Farrūkh and Farwandādh, presented Abū 'Ubaid with dishes of Persian food to honour him as they would a guest, and how Abū 'Ubaid refused to accept it because there was not enough for his entire army.[192] The issue is also reflected in the scene that describes 'Alī refusing to accept the gifts brought to him by the *dahāqīn* at Madā'in.[193] The Arab resistance to assimilation seems to have begun to break down by the time of Mu'āwiya and the association between the attitudes of the *dahāqīn* and the practice of bringing gifts to their rulers at Nawrūz and Mihrajān is heightened by the way in which the gradual adoption of the requirement of gifts on these two occasions by the Muslim government is associated with the recovery of the register of the crown lands in his reign. 'Abd Allāh b. Darrāj appears to have been the first to regularize the practice of receiving gifts at Nawrūz and Mihrajān in Muslim Iraq, collecting an additional ten million dirhams that way.[194] One of the main points to be made here is that the very length of time the *dahāqīn* survived in the Sawād, as well as their contacts with the Muslim rulers, was necessary for successful cultural transmission and assimilation. By the time the *dahāqīn* began to be suppressed, they had survived long enough after the conquest to transmit their style of life to a class of Muslim Arab landlords.[195]

Defectors and *mawālī* were equally important for the preservation and transmission of Sasanian military traditions. These involved mainly heavy cavalry equipment and tactics and the techniques of siegecraft. A good early example is the knowledge of siegecraft brought to the army of Sa'd at Bahurasīr by Shīrzādh, who had been forced to retire from Anbār to his own district of Sābāṭ as a result of Khālid's raid. After the battle of Qādisiyya, he came to terms with the Muslims, joined their army, and constructed twenty mangonels for Sa'd's use against Bahurasīr.[196] Of a similar nature is the occasion in Baṣra in 64/683 when 400 of the *asāwira* led by a man called Māh Afrīdhūn executed the Persian tactic of the five-arrow (*panjeqān*) enabling them to get off a volley of 2,000 arrows at a time.[197]

Along with such aspects of warfare, Persian military traditions influenced the use of armed servants and youths (*ghulāms*) as auxiliaries on the battlefield by Muslims. This was as much a social as a military institution, and the terms used for such persons usually imply some sort of social inferiority, paralleled by the occupation of inferior military ranks.[198] The *asāwira* were mainly responsible for the introduction of this practice into early Muslim military institutions. One of them, a certain 'Abd Allāh b. al-Iṣbahānī, had 400 such slaves (*mamlūks*) and was in command of the right wing of the army for

[191] Ṭabarī, I, p. 3350.
[192] Ibid., pp. 2170–1, 2173.
[193] Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, II, p. 218.
[194] Jahshiyārī, p. 21; Latz, p. 73. In a similar way the people of Balkh offered presents to their Muslim governor who was collecting the taxes in 32/652 because they were accustomed to offer presents at Mihrajān and Nawrūz (Ṭabarī, I, p. 2903; Zotenberg, III, p. 573). According to a letter of 'Umar II, the gifts at Nawrūz and Mihrajān were not to be included in the *kharāj* (Abū Yūsuf, p. 131).
[195] At Baṣra, Anas b. Malik, riding a *birdhawn* and wearing a thin black garment with a piece of cloth over his head to protect him from the sun, was mistaken for a *dihqān* (Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), pp. 10–11).
[196] Ṭabarī, I, pp. 2424, 2427.
[197] Ibid., II, p. 454. On the other hand, it should be noted that the Muslims did not adopt the Sasanian use of elephants in warfare. The Persians used elephants at both the battle of Buwaib and at Qādisiyya (Ibid., pp. 2190, 2298), and the elephant stables were at Sābāt (Mas'ūdī, II, p. 405; Qazwīnī, II, p. 257). The Muslims did not know what to do with them and treated them as booty. One elephant captured at Madā'in was sold to a man from Ḥīra, who covered it with a cloak and went around the villages exhibiting it (Balādhurī, p. 288). The stable (*dar al-fīl*) was granted by 'Umar as a fief to Abū Mufazzir (Ṭabarī, I, p. 2376).
[198] At any rate, the institution seems to have been in existence in something like this form under the late Sasanians. There is a reference to two *ghulāms* wearing the uniforms of Persian

[*continued on next page*

Muṣ'ab b. az-Zubayr in the battle that ended Mukhtār's revolt in Kūfa in 687.[199] It is no surprise, then, to find a reference to the armed *mawālī* of 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Āmir b. Kuraiz in 64/683, since his father was so closely associated with the *asāwira*.[200] The adoption of this practice, however, seems to have begun much earlier. In 36/656 there is a reference to a *mawlā* in the army of 'Alī prior to the battle of Siffīn named Mihrān, of whom both the terms *ghulām* and *mamlūk* are used.[201] Such people were most probably those Persian children taken captive in the course of the conquest who had grown up in Muslim service, rather than free converts to Islam. By the period of the Second Civil War, we are also likely to be dealing with second-generation *mawālī*. In any case, as with the *dahāqīn*, by the time the Persian military units had been disbanded their techniques and traditions had been adopted by Muslim Arab armies.

The overall effects of the events of the seventh century on the distribution of the Persian population in Iraq were therefore to remove the garrisons along the south-western frontier and much of the population east of the Tigris behind Madā'in, and to reconcentrate it in the form of captives, *mawālī*, and defectors in the new garrison cities of Baṣra and Kūfa, while the landed notables who came to terms with the Muslims continued to live as absentee landlords in the cities throughout Iraq or on their village-estates in the countryside. In spite of the elimination of the highest ranks of the Persian social structure and the temporary suppression of the clothing code, individual members of the high aristocracy, and probably even of the Sasanian royal family, maintained some status by becoming converts to Islam and becoming part of the new ruling class. Others preserved their status and their lands by taking positions of leadership in the Nestorian Church.

Where Persians survived as cohesive social groups, there is a noticeable tendency towards cultural and institutional inertia, a failure really to adapt to changing circumstances, and even attempts to impose the previous set of standards and ways of doing things on the new situation. Here the main examples are the landed Persian aristocracy which continued to exist in the agricultural districts of post-Sasanian Iraq, where the administrative and taxation systems of the previous régime survived at the lowest levels, and the Persian soldiers who defected from the Sasanian armies at the time of the conquest and joined the Muslims. In both cases, Persian methods of local administration and taxation, landholding and patterns of settlement, festivals, social customs, the lower levels of the class system, and military traditions, were preserved without significant change in early Muslim Iraq among those Persians who survived the conquest and maintained their heritage among themselves.

In addition, the institutional lag or overlapping represented by the survival of the *dahāqīn* as a distinct class and by the *asāwira* as a military unit into the early eighth century, lasted long enough for them to transmit the attitudes and lifestyle appropriate to a landed aristocracy and the equipment and military institutions associated with heavy cavalry tactics to Muslim Arabs. Transmission was encouraged by the way Persians expected that their new lords would want to be treated in the same way as their previous masters and acted accordingly. Channels of Persian cultural transmission were also provided by the presence of captive Persian women in Muslim households and by the existence of bilingual Arabs and Persians. One result of this situation, it should be pointed out, is that Persian influences on early Islamic society did not have to occur in Iran proper. Conditions in Iraq make that province seem almost more important for significant cultural interaction and assimilation. But it is equally important to realize that the Persian cultural presence in Muslim Iraq was not necessarily derived entirely from the pre-Islamic situation, because some cultural influences are just as likely to have been brought from Iran by captives or by Persians who migrated to the *amṣār* after the conquest.

continued from previous page]
horsemen in the dream of Sabhrishō' (catholicos 596–604) who were officers of the *barīd* (Scher, II (1), p. 486), and to a *ghulām* belonging to Jābān, the royal astronomer, at the time of the conquest (Ṭabarī, I, p. 2252). At Qādisiyya, with the Persian army of 120,000 men there were an equal number of "followers" (*atbā'*) present as servants or assistants (Ibid., p. 2264). Military attendants especially for cavalrymen were also present in the Persian army at the siege of Constantinople in 626 where, as labourers, they helped to harvest the crops found outside the city (Altheim, pp. 170–4; A. Stratos, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century* (Amsterdam, 1968), p. 182).

[199] Bālādhurī, p. 366.

[200] Ṭabarī, II, p. 464.

[201] Ibid., I, pp. 3266, 3267–8. In 61/680, a *ghulām* named Rustam who belonged to Shamir b. Dhī l-Jushn was in the force that massacred Ḥusain and his party at Karbalā (Ibid., II, p. 346). In 66/685, a *ghulām* of Mukhtār's at Kūfa named Zirbiyya is mentioned (Ibid., p. 599). Another Rustam is mentioned in 77/696 as the *ghulām* of Suwaid b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān the Khārijī (Ibid., p. 990). Yazīd b. Hurmuz al-Fārisī, a *mawlā* of the Banī Daws at Baṣra, is called amīr of the *mawālī* (Ibn Sa'd, VII (1), p. 160).